R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 775 AL 000 746

A SURVEY OF INTENSIVE PROGRAMS IN THE UNCOMMON LANGUAGES, SUMMER 1964.

BY- MILLER, ROY ANDREW
YALE UNIV., NEW HAVEN, CONN., INST. OF FAR EAST.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-6-37 PUB DATE 20 AUG 64
CONTRACT OEC-4-14-047
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.96 47P.

DESCRIPTORS- *INTENSIVE LANGUAGE COURSES, *SURVEYS, *UNCOMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES, AUDIOLINGUAL METHODS, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *SUMMER INSTITUTES, PROGRAM EVALUATION, NDEA INSTITUTES,

THIS SURVEY COVERED ALL BUT ONE (HAWAII) OF THE 22 NDEA INTENSIVE PROGRAMS IN THE UNCOMMON LANGUAGES FOR THE SUMMER OF 1964 (THE THIRD YEAR OF SUMMER LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION SUPPORTED BY TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT). THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION OF THE SURVEY, AND ALSO THE MOST DIFFICULT TO INVESTIGATE, DISCUSS, AND REACH CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING WAS--WHAT HAS BEEN, AND SPECIFICALLY FOR THE 1964 SUMMER PROGRAM, WHAT WAS THE GENERAL OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF SUCH INTENSIVE SUMMER LANGUAGE PROGRAMS. THE SURVEY OBSERVED THAT THESE PROGRAMS WERE SEEN TO BE ACHIEVING THEIR GOALS BEST IN THE CASE OF A FEW MAJOR CENTERS LOCATED AT INSTITUTIONS WITH JOINTLY-OPERATED AND LONG-ESTABLISHED ACADEMIC YEAR PROGRAMS IN UNCOMMON LANGUAGES AND AREA WORK. IN THE OTHER CASES THEY WERE OFTEN SEEN TO BE PROVIDING UNDOUBTED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS, BUT OFTEN THE NATURE OF THIS TRAINING AND ITS SCOPE WERE SO FAR ISOLATED FROM ANY PROGRAM IN WHICH THESE SAME STUDENTS MIGHT POSSIBLY BE CONTINUING IN SEPTEMBER AS TO CREATE PROBABLY AS MANY PROBLEMS AS THEY SOLVE. SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS SUGGESTED FOR FORTHCOMING SUMMER LANGUAGE PROPOSALS INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING--(1) SERIOUS ATTENTION SHOULD BE PAID TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AUDIOLINGUAL METHOD OF INSTRUCTION FOR ALL ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE CLASSES AND AS FAR AS POSSIBLE FOR ALL INTERMEDIATE LANGUAGE CLASSES. (2) THE STAFF SHOULD BE ADEQUATE AND COMPETENT AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF PROSPECTIVE STAFF MEMBERS SHOULD GO INTO GREATER DETAIL. (3) THE TEACHING MATERIALS SHOULD BE SATISFACTORY AND DESCRIBED CAREFULLY. (4) STUDENTS WITH PREVIOUS LANGUAGE WORK SHOULD BE CAREFULLY TESTED, SCREENED, AND PLACED. A COPY OF THIS SURVEY IS ALSO AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST FROM THE INSTITUTE OF FAR EASTERN LANGUAGES, 2505A YALE STATION, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 20065. (AMM)

Title VI - No 37
P.A. 48

ED018775

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A SURVEY OF INTENSIVE PROGRAMS IN THE UNCOMMON LANGUAGES,

Summer 1964

by

Roy Andrew Miller

Yale University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Roy Andrew Miller TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

New Haven
Institute of Far Eastern Languages
2505A Yale Station
August 20, 1964

AL 000 746

NOTE

In its present form this report consists of 225 copies of the subject data prepared under the terms of, described in, and submitted in completion of contract #OE-4-14-047 between Yale University and the Language Development Branch, Language Research Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The distribution of these 225 copies will be determined by the Language Development Branch. Such distribution is not considered to constitute publication of this report, which will later be made available to the public in a permanent trade or other edition. In its present form this report is intended only for the distribution given it by the Language Development Branch.

Copyright © 1964 by the author. All Rights Reserved.

Contents

0.	Background	1
1.	The Survey	4
2.	Over-all Questions	7
3.	Three Main Themes	12
4.	Seven Problem Areas	21
5.	Recommendations	34
Appendix I.	The NDEA-Supported Summer 1964 Intensive Language Programs	37
Appendix II.	Bibliography	40
Appendix III.	Suggested Form for Documentation of Summer Proposals on Implementation of the Audio-lingual Method	43

0. Background

A short account of the circumstances out of which this report grew may aid the reader in using and evaluating its contents. Under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, over $700,000 has been given for summer programs of instruction at NDEA Centers since 1960. The 1964 summer programs completed the fifth year of summer instruction supported on a matching basis by Federal funds. Thus, at least $1,400,000 has been spent on such programs.

The summer of 1962 marked the beginning of a transition. Support had hitherto been given for whatever summer instruction a Center wished to offer and had been provided under the terms of a single annual contract. In 1962, in order to emphasize the significance of summer work, summer programs began to be separated from academic year contracting and by summer 1963 nearly all of the supported programs were the subjects of separate contracts. By 1964 it was possible to support all summer programs by writing separate contracts.

Such separate contracting has been the instrument for introducing two substantial changes in summer programming: (1) contracts are now written with an overriding (though not exclusive) focus on intensive language instruction; and (2) each summer now constitutes an annual competition for NDEA support, unlike the academic year arrangement whereby continued support has been assured from year to year.

In each of the past two years, many of the summer programs were examined with a view to identifying some of their problems and charting more accurately those courses and directions which should be encouraged. A Survey of Intensive Programs in the Uncommon Languages, Summer 1962, widely known in the profession as the "Yamagiwa Report," set forth certain initial guidelines for intensive summer language programs based on visits to many of the programs at both NDEA and non-NDEA Centers by a team of experts. The "Shively Report" of 1963, based on a more informal examination of programs, assessed the overall quality of performance in summer programs and further refined the concept, as well as the special problems, of intensive language instruction in compact, self-contained summer programs.

The third year of such summer language instruction, the fifth year of NDEA-supported instruction for the summer, clearly afforded a good opportunity for a more comprehensive assessment than had previously been made. The Office of Education felt that it should be possible in the summer of 1964 not only to examine individual Center performance but also to assess accumulated summer experience and in its light to identify certain still unresolved problems. Hopefully, this more comprehensive assessment might even be expected to determine the place that intensive summer language instruction should fill in the overall national academic effort in the uncommon languages over the next five or more years.

In order to accomplish this a survey was proposed which would attempt to study and report on both experiences and practices at most of the intensive summer language programs receiving support under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. This survey was also to attempt an analysis of the larger questions of public and institutional policies adumbrating

these summer language programs. The survey would aim at producing a report containing data and conclusions which hopefully might serve as a guide both for institutional and for Office of Education policy.

The survey was planned in detail in late May, 1964 and was carried out between the effective date of the contract, June 25, and August 3, 1964. In addition to a principal investigator, the author of this report, the survey team consisted of Jackson H. Bailey (Earlham College), Patrick D. Hanan (Stanford University), Majed Sa'id (Princeton University), and J.A.B. van Buitenen (University of Chicago).

The method adopted for the survey was one of short personal visits by the principal investigator and the other members of the team to all but one of the NDEA-supported Centers offering intensive summer language programs. The institutions visited were the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Colorado, Columbia University, Cornell University, Duke University, Duquesne University, Fordham University, Harvard University, Indiana University, the University of Michigan, New York University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Southern California, Stanford University, Tulane University, the University of Utah, and the University of Wisconsin. The University of Colorado program was a joint venture with the University of Kansas. It proved impossible to send a member of the survey team to visit a program supported at the University of Hawaii. For a list of the twenty-two intensive language programs supported by the NDEA in the summer of 1964, the official designations of their activities and their directors, see Appendix I; a comparison of this list with the institutions named immediately above will show something of the scale and range of the survey.

In addition to these Centers, one program not receiving NDEA summer support, namely the CIC Far Eastern Language Institute at Indiana University was also visited briefly, since the government felt that it constituted a cooperative summer program of considerable interest.

At the conclusion of the individual visits to the Centers a series of meetings was held in Bloomington, Indiana from July 31 through August 3. The principal investigator and the other members of the survey team were joined for most of these meetings by Donald N. Bigelow (U.S. Office of Education), and at one session, particularly devoted to problems of cooperation in summer programs, by a group of invited guests consisting of George Cardona (Pennsylvania), William B. Edgerton (Indiana), John J. Gumperz (California, Berkeley), Alan A. Komai (Princeton), Albert H. Marckwardt (Princeton), Denis Sinor (Indiana), and Joseph K. Yamagiwa (Michigan). Donald H. Shively (Harvard) also was present at another of the sessions.

The work of these meetings in Bloomington was primarily the comparison of the survey's individual findings and the determination of the main themes of the present report. It was greatly enhanced by the simultaneous presence on the Indiana campus of both the Summer Linguistic Institute and the Linguistic Society of America's annual summer meeting. These, together with the CIC Institute, provided the survey members with many opportunities for private professional consultation apart from their formal sessions together. The general consensus both in findings and in views which these meetings in Bloomington revealed gave the members of the survey team confidence that it would be possible for the principal investigator, working from his own notes

and with the help of a rapporteur, William Fender (Yale), who attended all the Bloomington meetings, to prepare the final report. This report, however, has not been read or approved in final draft by the survey team members apart from the principal investigator. Hence the author, the principal investigator, takes full responsibility for the contents of this report and, more importantly, for those places where inevitably he has failed to some degree to give adequate expression to less striking differences of opinion and findings on the part of the survey team.

The entire survey was possible only because of the kindness and cooperation which the directors, staff, faculty and students in the Centers extended to the survey at all the institutions visited. All the members of the survey were impressed with the extraordinary degree of cooperation that they received in every stage of their work. It would be appropriate to list in detail each person at the Centers visited whose contributions of time and information in the midst of a generally hot and busy summer made it possible for the survey to do its work and to do it efficiently. But such a list would inevitably omit perhaps as many names as could be recorded, and the consensus of the survey was that so many people had extended help that it would be impossible to list them all here.

The physical facilities arranged for the Bloomington meetings on the Indiana University campus also contributed greatly to whatever the survey has been able to accomplish.

1. The Survey

The survey upon which this report is based can perhaps best be understood by stating at the beginning what it did not attempt to do as well as describing those areas which it attempted to cover with some thoroughness. Specifically, the members of the survey agreed insofar as possible to avoid undue attention to detailed statistical items both in their visiting of programs as well as in their later reports to the principal investigator of the survey. This was done for several reasons. The most important was the fact that each of the Center directors regularly submits to the government a complete technical report upon the completion of his summer program. Through this report and by means of other communications both the government and the interested segments of the profession find it comparatively easy to obtain more accurate and probably more up-to-date statistical information than it was felt this survey could provide. This does not mean that on visits to the various programs members of the survey did not under any circumstances concern themselves with numbers and quantities. Rather, it means that their primary intention in visiting the programs, in observing classes and in talking with faculty, staff and students, was not to measure, list, or tabulate, but rather to attempt to gain some idea of the overall effectiveness of these summer language programs, then later at the Bloomington meetings to share their findings and opinions, and thus hopefully come up with recommendations on the role and character of possible government support for intensive summer language work in the future. This summation and these recommendations are hence the main concern of this report.

At the beginning of the survey, the principal investigator and staff members of the Office of Education worked together in drafting a short, informal check-list of items which was given to each member of the survey and which each member used as a guide on his visits to the Centers. Apart from this check-list, which attempted to set forth in the briefest terms possible the current main areas of government concern in support of intensive summer language programs, no attempt was made to unify or even to coordinate the visits themselves. Each member of the survey enjoyed and used complete individual discretion in deciding what he would do, what he would look for and what he would ask at the programs he visited. This proved to be a worthwhile precaution, since the programs visited covered an enormous range. Some were large programs in languages which have been consistently offered in the American university curriculum for several decades; others were small experimental programs involving only a few people on both sides of the classroom desk in languages which are not only in the technical sense neglected and uncommon, but which represent cultures and peoples so remote from the usual American academic experience as to be in some cases all but unknown even by name to the members of the survey.

Regardless of the great range of activities which were thus visited at the Centers, all the members of the survey stressed visits to and observation of the various types of classroom work in language and visits to and observation of language laboratories and other audio-visual activities. It was felt from the beginning of the survey, and the Bloomington meetings bore out the validity of this, that the language instruction classroom itself is the only real critical point of impact in any intensive summer language

program, and that hence it was here that the limited time available to the survey team for visits could best be used.

The contract under which the survey herein reported was undertaken was an extremely modest one with very limited financial support. It provided for two-day visits to the larger Centers and one-day visits to smaller activities. It was hoped that a survey member visiting a program for two days would find it possible to follow at least a few sections of intensive language work from one classroom or laboratory activity to another through the two-day span. Ideally this would have provided the survey with some sense of the instructional dynamic of any given intensive summer language program. In actual practice, unfortunately, this ideal proved to be a difficult one, since most summer language programs generally and quite properly concentrate their teaching in the morning hours. This meant that in many cases transportation problems would cut into the survey time available in the morning, that there would be little to see or do in the afternoon and that on the second day it would be necessary to look at different activities or another Center and impossible to follow up those visited the previous day. This was especially true where the survey member found it necessary to visit more than one center on a single campus in the course of a single trip. If a survey of this type is attempted again, it would seem necessary to provide for a longer visit to each of the large Centers than was possible this time. Apart from this qualification, however, the members of the survey team seem in general to have experienced no great difficulty in learning enough about the work of each Center to obtain the data which they then shared among the entire group at the Bloomington meetings.

Immediately following his visit to a Center, each member of the survey submitted to the principal investigator a detailed written report on his visit and on his findings at the Center visited. These reports not only covered the above-mentioned informal check-list identifying the main areas of government concern, but also touched upon what are often purely statistical or organizational matters. These reports were circulated among the members of the survey at the Bloomington meetings and have been drawn upon in the preparation of the present report. They were then submitted to the government by the principal investigator separately from this report, since it was felt they would be most useful to the government when used together with the Center directors' technical reports. Since of necessity these detailed reports of visits contain information which is identified by name and place, and since much of this information might if read out of context be mistakenly felt to be unduely critical of various facets of the work of the Centers, they have been and will continue to be treated as confidential documents. It was felt at the conclusion of the Bloomington meetings that all the data in these individual written reports on visits which could be of benefit either to the language teaching profession or to the government could be extracted and presented in this present report without identification of the places or persons actually involved on either side of the survey. For this reason the present report identifies neither programs nor persons by name nor, it is hoped, even by implication.

Two possibilities suggested themselves for the organization of this report. One would have been to present the survey data for each Center in turn; but this could hardly have been useful given the decision above to relegate all identification of the Centers and individuals to the confidential individual reports. This made it necessary to adopt a second

alternative and to attempt a treatment arranged by general themes and similarities in problems or achievements as identified by the survey visits.

The Bloomington meetings brought out surprisingly and gratifyingly large areas of agreement among the survey members, who had until that weekend worked totally independently of each other. This agreement extended from their experiences and impressions on their visits through to their findings and even up to their views on overall recommendations. Considering the great diversities of the activities visited and remembering the even greater diversities in the interests and competences of the visitors, such agreement was not only extremely welcome but was also felt by the survey members as a group to be significant. It has also made far easier the task of the principal investigator in attempting to reduce the hundreds of hours of survey visits, report writing and conferences which underlie the present report into what can now only be hoped is a reasonably coherent whole.

Inevitably this whole process of reduction has meant that at every step smaller differences and minor qualifications to general statements have had to be glossed over in favor of the larger similarities or the more significant patterns. Something of the problem involved here was well expressed by a member of the survey who began the discussion at the Bloomington meetings with the suggestion that it would be necessary, both at those meetings and in the final report, to preface very single statement made concerning the survey with the qualification "No valid general statements are possible, but .. " This concern, which was initially felt by all members of the survey, fortunately proved to be more of an appar nt problem at the beginning of the Bloomington meetings than it was a real one at their end. As the members of the survey worked through their findings together, they discovered such wide areas of agreement both in the observations and in their proposed recommendations that it no longer seems necessary to qualify the general statements of this report except as they are automatically qualified by the nature of the research out of which they grew.

2. Over-all Questions

The most important question which the survey set for itself was also the most difficult of all to investigate, to discuss, and to reach conclusions concerning. This problem, most simply stated, was: What has been, and specifically in the summer of 1964 what was, the general overall effectiveness of intensive summer language programs in the uncommon languages supported by the NDEA? Without some kind of answer, qualified though it may have to be, to this basic problem any other findings would be virtually meaningless.

The way in which the NDEA-supported intensive summer programs in these languages came into being is documented elsewhere in this report. This course of their development is clearly still somewhat symptomatic of the present state of these programs as observed in the course of the 1964 summer survey. Put most bluntly, they were very often not planned; they usually simply grew. Their growth is hence, while remarkable, more of the variety of a sudden genetic mutation, with all that this implies, than it is the healthy, controlled and well-organized growth that is surely necessary for any achievement of long-range academic or national goals. So long as intensive summer language programs remain in the status of mutants, there is always the danger that they will be, if not actually academic freaks, at the very least ungainly and ill-articulated members of the community. Perhaps this report will help to point out some of the ways in which the evident energies of many of these programs can be more closely channeled into what the members of the survey could not but agree should be regarded as more normal and genetically "truer" paths of development.

Since the intensive summer language work under NDEA support observed in the summer of 1964 was clearly the result of far more support, enthusiasm and vigor than of planning and concern for its overall articulation with the work in the rest of the academic year, it is difficult to say if this summer work has indeed reached the point toward which it was intended to go, since this point has not yet been identified. Hence in one sense no valid answerwas possible to the question of whether the programs visited were doing what they were intended to do. Those few cases where the summer directors of the Centers were also concerned with a closely related academic-year program in the same language and area field often seemed to have the clearest, most easily stated goals for summer work. Here too the summer programs observed seemed to be doing the most creditable jobs in attaining their goals. One Center director, for example, of long experience in language and area work and responsible not only for the summer program visited but also for the academic year program with which it is closely artiuclated, felt that it was the summer intensive language program at his Center which now for the first time made it possible for his entire academic year program to function on a creditable level. He was strongly of the opinion, and in his case this was based at least upon his own impressive experience if not on demonstrable evidence, that if the opportunities provided to his Center students for intensive language work in the summer months were to be withdrawn the entire academic-year efficiency of his Center would be seriously impaired. There is a genuine possibility here that this tells the observer at least as much about the level of language instruction available at the Center concerned during the academic year

as it does about the achievements of its intensive summer programs; but even with such a reservation in mind it is a significant opinion which was encountered several times in the course of the survey. (Such opinions would of course carry greater weight could they be documented by evidence capable of measurement, but this appears not generally to have been the case.)

Another director of a smaller and much newer Center stated with conviction that the three NDEA-supported summer language programs here meant that for the first time in over two decades of graduate teaching his American students, as distinguished from those with European educational backgrounds, were now able to work effectively in his graduate classes and seminars with primary sources in the uncommon languages. For his Center the withdrawal of the opportunity for such intensive summer work would clearly mean a lowering of standards which it has taken his classes decades to reach. Other similar views, not all of them to be sure based on such impressive experience, and few if any based on evidence, could be cited in support of the survey's overall conclusion that the problem is not one of whether or not there shall be further NDEA-supported summer language programs, but rather the more complex one of what they shall consist and of how they shall be administered and taught.

The intensive summer language program has in the past three years made a place for itself in the academic-year body, and it is evidently not an organism whose advances the host can easily repell. Partly this is a tribute to and by implication also an evaluation of these programs. But also it reflects the fact that American higher education itself is resolutely moving toward a twelve-month annual basis for all its activities, so that when this has been pushed to its logical conclusion the problem of a summer language program will in some senses be simply one of the time of year in which it takes place and will have little other academic significance. On the other hand, the problem of an intensive summer language program will probably not be significantly affected by the general tendency toward a twelve-month academic year. This meake it necessary, as will be done below in the present report, to focus particular attention upon the meaning of "intensive." As we shall see, there has been a discernible trend toward treating "intensive" simply as an adjective more or less synonymous with "summer." Both the literature in the field and all of the experience of the survey members show that this is in error; the point will be elaborated elsewhere in this report.

Given the above qualifications, the NDEA-supported intensive summer language programs, as observed by the survey in the summer of 1964, were seen to be achieving their goals best in the case of a few major Centers located at institutions with jointly-operated and long-established academic year programs in uncommon language and area work. In the other cases they were often seen to be providing undoubted training opportunities for students, but often the nature of this training and its scope were so far isolated from any program in which these same students might possibly be continuing in September as to create probably as many problems as they solved.

Language offerings represented the major investment of both manpower and financial resources in the 1964 summer programs; hence the visits and this report following them concerned themselves chiefly with language work. The area offerings range from a single course necessary for formal requirement fulfillment in some Centers to full-scale curricula in a wide variety

of social science and other disciplines at others. A few Centers, especially certain of those concerned with Portuguese and Russian, have made impressive progress toward integrating their area offerings with their language work. Such integration is especially impressive when, for example, area courses are taught to language students in the language they are concurrently studying and when their presentation is, as was observed in a very few instances, closely coordinated with the other language work of the summer so as to reinforce and intensify it.

This most desirable pattern was however the exception and not the rule. By and large the area courses were unwanted stepchildren in the NDEA-supported intensive summer language programs in 1964. In too many cases they in addition provided a potential source of competition for the student's limited time. This was especially critical in the case of the graduate student whose growing maturity of interest and academic program considerations make it extremely easy for him to neglect his language training in favor of area courses. Since one of the great strengths of the academic-year Center programs is to be found in the range and richness of their non-language offerings, and since there is general agreement that summer is a time when certain things can probably be done in language which either are not or can not be done in the academic year, the necessity for resolution of this conflict in favor of language work seems clear. Most simply stated, the survey found that there were suprisingly few cases in which area work in an intensive summer language program did more than provide the student with a distraction in his language work, but these exceptions showed a direction in which the conflict could be resolved to the mutual benefit to both types of activities.

In Centers largely devoted to Far Eastern languages the area work usually seemed all but divorced from language work. Students at such Centers in the summer of 1964 were provided with almost no opportunities for area courses which would reinforce their language skills. This clearly serves to discourage intensive language students in the early stages of their study since they feel that there will be but little opportunity for them to use the language either now or in their later content courses. The contradiction implied here is all the more striking since many of the Far Eastern area courses are taught by native speakers of Chinese and Japanese. The survey found it difficult to understand why at a few Centers at least, certain area scholars who were also native speakers of these languages had not been encouraged to teach area offerings in these languages. A class taught even in excellent English by a native speaker of Chinese or Japanese can hardly be an effective way in which to provide area instruction to students who have already spent a great deal of time in attempting to gain some fluency in these languages, and there is even less point when as more often than not the area teacher's English leaves much to be desired.

For this particular problem many Centers would do well to study and attempt to reproduce the effective use of the target language in area course offerings which the survey observed at certain Portuguese and Russian Centers. South and Southeast Asian programs present their own special problems here, and it would be both misleading and unfair to treat them solely along the same lines as suggested here for areas with a single important sommon language. If a South or Southeast Asian Center is to have area work and if such area courses are to be avialable to more than a few students, then clearly it is difficult to conceive of teaching them in Hindi, or Thai, or the like. But for students involved with the Far East there is little justification

for continuing the virtual blackout on the use of Chinese and Japanese in area courses which was observed in the summer of 1964. One fringe benefit in implementing this recommendation would be that it would then be possible to provide summer area work by visiting Chinese and Japanese scholars on a level of academic and scholarly excellence significantly higher than that observed in 1964. So long as such area offerings must be taught in English, the level of academic excellence of much of the summer area work will be a continuing problem.

Keeping these qualifications in mind, the findings of the survey indicate that an intensive summer language program is above all a time and place for intensive language study, and that while different Centers will always probably wish to have different types of conditions of area courses, area work potentially conflict with language, and great care is needed to insure that the conflict is successfully resolved in each particular instance. In fact, one of the most workable if not perhaps the most carefully thought out definition which the survey could evolve for "intensive" as in intensive language programs was simply "a course of study which requires the full time of the student's day, apart from feeding, sleeping, and other normal housekeeping duties." (This is a time-oriented, not a linguistic or methodological view of "intensive," on which see more below.) If this is what intensive implies, it is clear that area work, unless carefully integrated with and directed toward the same goals as language work, soon becomes a potential difficulty. As an overall guideline, the survey recommends that in any instance where assigning resources to an intensive summer language program will either in fact or by implication remove these resources from the potential of an academic year program, the needs of the academic year program are to be given the priority. In the same way, whenever assigning resources to summer area work will remove these resources from the potential of either a summer language program or any aspect of an academic year program, the academic year program and then the summer language program are to be given the priority, in that order. So long as the manpower and the fiscal resources avialable for summer language programs are not unlimited, this recommendation implies a more careful husbandry to insure that summer language and area programs are always supported only with that which would not otherwise normally be avialable for the academic year. The long range overall goals of the NDEA will not, in the opinion of the survey, be advanced if either manpower or money is taken from the potential of the academic year and transferred into summer work.

The most valid generalization which the survey was able to evolve for intensive summer language work as it was observed in 1964 was the decision to view it as a necessary present expedient but not as a permanent feature of the national academic scene; something, in other words, which will be necessary to see the needs of the national interest through the present decade, but for which this decade itself is one of transition. The uncommon languages are still not taught either sufficiently well or sufficiently often in our colleges. We still must teach the uncommon languages in the colleges on levels of work which should properly be the concern of secondary education, and even this is, to be sure, only true when we teach them in the colleges at all. Too often we must still teach beginning graduate students on levels of work in the uncommon languages which they should have mastered in college or even in secondary school. Nationally, this situation is now being remedied. Thanks almost entirely to the support which has been possible under the NDEA we are able to state with conviction that this is in fact a transition decade,

and that in the not too distant future both colleges and graduate schools will be able to give their whole concern and resources over to teaching the uncommon languages on those levels and those levels alone which are their proper concern. In this sense, then, intensive summer language programs are now and for the next several years a temporary expedient. Their existence and their development must not be allowed to inhibit or retard the existence and long-term development of academic-year programs. This would be to reverse the entire cycle and to discourage exactly that improvement in the national situation of language teaching and that enhancement of the national standards of proficiency in the uncommon languages at which the NDEA aims.

3. Three Main Themes

As the survey team studied its reports it seemed possible to group many of the individual findings along the lines of three main themes. These three seemed to the survey to be of particular importance, and individual sessions in the Bloomington meetings were devoted to each of them in turn. As might be expected, it was also found that there was a great amount of overlapping among these themes and that any presentation of data arranged in this fashion would inevitably contain much duplication. Still, since both the summer programs visited and the findings of the visits were in themselves sets of details growing out of details, such overlapping is perhaps a necessity out of which hopefully some virtue can be made.

The three main themes were:

(1), the problems of undergraduate colleges in their attempt to introduce non-Western language and area studies into their curricula. In what ways and to what extent do these colleges find themselves involved in and associated with intensive summer language programs? Are there significant areas of concern here which should be identified? The problem is an important one since it is from these undergraduate colleges, largely devoted to the four-year liberal arts curriculum, that we must look for our annual supply of graduate students for possible specialization in the uncommon language and area programs.

(2), the problems of intensive summer language programs as they relate to graduate work for specialists in language and literature programs. How do the needs of this important segment of students differ from those of others, including the area specialists? How are these problems being met by the summer language programs? Should more or less be done in this connection?

(3), the problems of cooperation among Centers and non-Center institutions in summer language work. The only non-NDEA-supported program visited by the survey was a cooperative venture in its second year of existence. Several of the NDEA programs visited were also impressive cooperative ventures involvinb both supported Centers and non-supported institutions. Is the summer a time for such cooperation, and if so what does it tell us about the nature and structure of our academic-year work? Are there positive benefits from cooperation over and above the supposedly obvious ones of economy in the use of manpower and fiscal resources, and are these economies as real as they seem to be obvious?

In respect to the first main theme, the survey was able to identify three propositions which conveniently sum up its findings in this area.

(1) Non-Western area work is now playing a substantial and increasing role in the undergraduate college curriculum. The resources devoted to this effort must be further increased if the need here is to be met effectively. The legitimacy of this proposition has gained wide acceptance during the past two or three years, yet major problems remain. The reasons for this situation fall into three categories: personnel, materials, and finances.

Only recently has there been the interest and the opportunity for undergraduate college faculty to develop the competence necessary to teach about non-Western areas. These interests and opportunities are now developing rapidly in many parts of the country. Most of the attention at present is to re-training existing faculty, but this can be only a short-term solution. Eventually the graduate schools must produce historians, philosophers, scholars of literature, etc. who are well-trained in their own disciplines, who have competence in the necessary languages and materials for their non-Western area and who are interested in and firmly committed to teaching in undergraduate college programs.

In order for the non-Western undergraduate program to be academically sound it must have the services and leadership of at least one well-trained specialist. Without such a person, who must be competent in the language of the area in addition to being well-grounded in a discipline, proper control over standards and good judgment in matters of library acquisitions and course planning are likely to be lacking. During the past two or three years a growing number of good materials (translations, monographs, and secondary works) for use in teaching about the non-Western areas has appeared. This trend needs further encouragement and support. We need a major effort to secure the reprinting of basic materials in Western languages.

Undergraduate colleges face serious handicaps in developing work related to the non-Western areas. They cannot afford to hire many specialists and must, therefore, encourage their regular faculty to add such competence. With the development of a wide variety of opportunities for such training this problem may be on the way to its solution; but until such a solution is rather closer than it is today, other expedients must be actively considered. Later in this report considerable attention is given to the roles of the linguist and the native informant in the application of the audio-lingual method of language instruction. This provides a rational division of labor, and also implies important possibilities for the effective and economical use of a limited number of specialists. These possibilities have great application to the problems of the smaller colleges in this connection, but unfortunately they are still by and large possibilities which have not been completely explored.

The rising interest in non-Western course work is putting new demands on college libraries, demands which have still hardly been assessed to say nothing of being met. Foundation grants for faculty training and program development have, with a few notable exceptions, failed to recognize this as a growing problem. The problem is t[illegible]-fold. Library staff need training in order to be able to deal effectively with the search, acquisition, processing and use of Western language materials. Handling materials in the non-Western languages presents additional problems. Funds are desperately needed for the acquisition and processing of these materials. As attention to non-Western areas grows in undergraduate programs these pressures on the libraries will grow in almost geometric proportions.

A further problem related to staffing undergraduate non-Western programs is the need for funds for research for specialists teaching in these programs. Unless these men can have access to materials and substantial support for their research they will inevitably be drawn off by the larger universities which provide more ready access to such funds. If undergraduate

programs are to be soundly conceived, staffed and developed they must be able to provide support for professional growth and advancement that is roughly competitive with the university centers.

(2) Training in the uncommon languages is not only possible at the undergraduate level, but it must be actively encouraged and promoted.

This proposition is now receiving serious attention in some undergraduate institutions but it has by no means been widely accepted. The reasons for this are primarily related to personnel and finances, but secondarily include such factors as student interest, faculty convincement, and the folk-lore level assumption that such languages cannot be taught effectively. Many faculty members and administrators resist this proposition for the secondary reasons named. Even if acceptance is forthcoming serious problems in implementation remain. There now is evidence that these languages can be taught effectively, but this information needs to be given wider circulation. There is also evidence of rising interest among students even on small college campuses. This interest will surely grow during the next four or five years.

Many colleges still teach Romance languages only in the traditional ways in large classes. This is neither possible nor effective with the uncommon non-Western languages. College administrators must change their concept of what constitutes an economic operation if these courses are to be taught properly. This will undoubtedly result in a "back-lash" response from the traditional language departments whose faculty will resent the supposed "diversion" of resources as well as (even more important educationally) the new demands made upon them to teach more effectively. Resistance because of lack of personnel and finances is somewhat more legitimate; it deserves attention and suggests the continuing need for a cautious approach to the development of much uncommon language work on the college level.

It is difficult for colleges to find well-trained and effective teachers for the uncommon non-Western languages. Some say that the supply is so limited that undergraduate programs have no right to draw on the existing supply; this view needs further discussion and evaluation. Furthermore, as interest in the uncommon languages increases, the temptation to use untrained native speakers or others with inadequate training to staff programs in the colleges will grow stronger and stronger. This can only perpetuate the myth that these languages are too difficult to teach in the normal college curriculum. Summer programs, perhaps especially cooperative summer programs, would be one way in which to share available manpower resources among a number of colleges, as would cooperative academic year arrangements for geographically contiguous institutions.

A serious potential problem in the development of non-Western language work in the colleges is posed by rivalry and competition in the development of materials at the larger institutions and Centers. College graduates who have used one set of materials may be handicapped in graduate work at a Center which uses a different system. To sum up this second proposition, a major effort needs to be launched to train college teachers of the uncommon languages, coordination of efforts in the development of language materials needs to be given major attention and advisory and consultation services for undergraduate colleges which desire to set up language programs

need to be provided. It is essential that such services, if and when made available, be representative of the developments in the major university Centers, to avoid misdirecting the activities in the smaller colleges.

(3) If undergraduate non-Western language and area programs are to develop effectively they must be carefully coordinated with both summer and academic year efforts at the major university centers. Much more creative thought and imaginative experimentation is needed if this coordination is to be effected. For language study this coordination must give attention to course organization and content in the colleges and it must relate this to the intensive work, if any, to be done by college students in the summers.

Coordination must also be effected in the development of materials for use in college programs and in summer intensive work. The colleges will be helpless bystanders and their students the victims of institutional competition if the development of materials gets out of hand.

One important challenge looms on the horizon as undergraduate and even high school programs for teaching non-Western languages spread. Until very recently most graduate programs in non-Western language and area work assumed that students would start their language study in all but the commomly taught European languages at the graduate level. This situation is beginning to change, and the rate of change here will accelerate. The graduate schools must adjust to this fact and encourage the shift of such training to the undergraduate level. This can be successful only if there is close cooperation between the colleges and the Centers. This is uncharted territory, and good will on both sides will be required if friction, resentment and misunderstanding are to be avoided.

College faculty need to be eccouraged to make even more use of intensive summer area and language programs as a means of upgrading and strengthening their own work. Such work can also be an important factor in the process of coordination of work in the colleges with that at the Centers. College faculty can keep abreast of new developments in the field in this way, but caution is needed to avoid giving college administration and faculty and misleading impression that a summer or two is all it requires to turn out competent persons in these fields.

There is a need for careful exploration of the whole field by joint committees of representatives of the Centers, the summer programs and the colleges. Mobilization of resources for a major effort in language and area work at the undergraduate level is essential if academic standards are to be maintained and duplication of effort and function is to be avoided. The colleges cannot do an effective job in isolation; on the other hand the universities are, in the long run, dependent for good graduate students on the undergraduate programs.

Finally, in all this planning it is necessary to anticipate trends and developments in order to design programs which will meet the needs of from five to ten years from now, not solely those of today.

In the survey's consideration of the second of these main themes, involving intensive summer language programs with graduate work in the uncommon languages and literatures, a sharp differentiation with the problems

involving students of area studies was immediately seen. For students in area studies the summer programs, regardless of their other successes or failures, clearly help many to acquire some skill in some language which they might not otherwise have acquired, to learn it somewhat better than they might otherwise have, and to learn it a little earlier in their careers than they would probably otherwise have done. This is because for these students the content courses make heavy demands on the time available for the academic-year curriculum. Without summer language programs whether their period of training would be considerably prolonged, or, the more likely alternative, their language training, in many cases already critically weak, would tend to be neglected further.

But with advanced and specialized graduate students in languages and literatures the case is somewhat different. Clearly for them the summer programs are not the essentials that they still seem to represent for area, discipline and content curricula. Some have even felt, and the members of the survey team had it brought to their attention on more than one occasion, that intensive summer language programs present their most serious problems here. Retention and learning-in-depth were often mentioned and clearly imply special difficulties for these students in summer work. They can, to be sure, benefit from any saving of time in their training program as much as any others; the question is rather whether such saving in time is real enough in their special cases to offset the fact which the survey team noted over and over again, that <u>all but a few</u> intensive summer language courses inevitably fall short of what are loosely termed their academic-year equivalents. This problem is treated below in somewhat greater detail; here it will be sufficient to note that even the best and most effective intensive summer language teaching which could be observed in the summer of 1964 generally gave little evidence that it was able to provide the advanced student in languages and literatures with that control-in-depth of the language and that long-range retention of materials "covered" which his work demands. This is somewhat unrelated to what the same language course might, at the same time, be doing for a student of history or sociology or geography who is essentially seeking a skill or a tool which will unlock the literature in the field or the primary sources to him.

For graduate students of languages and literatures one of the main values which could be isolated in this survey of summer programs was the opportunity that they present for such a student to acquire some skill in a second or third uncommon language, relevant to his field, without sacrificing the same amount of time that such acquisition would require during the academic year. Thus the student of Chinese language or Chinese literature, who must inevitably learn Japanese if he is to control the literature in his field, is well advised to do this in an intensive summer course. A student of Japanese should probably acquire what he needs to know of Chinese or of Korean in the same way, and other combinations are possible depending on the field. The survey noted with some disappointment that there was little evidence at most Centers that this, probably one of the most effective roles that intensive summer language instruction can play, was being implemented at anything close to its maximum potential. There is still apparently much work to be done in preparing course materials and in arranging course offerings to take advantage of the possibilities inherent here.

Another potential strength of intensive summer language programs for the advanced student in language and literature which seems not to have been

fully realized is in providing summer work at the advanced level to supplement course work available to the student at his own institution rather than to substitute for it. Perhaps this is not easily distinguished from the last point above, but what is meant here would be, for example, readings in Buddhist or other texts in Tibetan or Mongolian, made available at one or more Centers in the summer and providing students of Chinese or Japanese with the opportunity for work in such highly specialized fields under thoroughly competent scholars whose efforts otherwise would inevitably be directed only toward those few students in academic-year residence on their own campuses. Here also would be a good opportunity to make effective use of visiting scholars from the Far East, who could be encouraged to teach in Chinese or Japanese.

In this same connection should be mentioned the possible value of summer courses dealing with the linguistic and philological aspects of the study of the uncommon languages, including their history, structure, phonology, etc. Few institutions can afford academic-year posts in such fields and fewer still are the scholars qualified to fill such posts even were they to exist. Summer language programs can, and to some extent in 1964 did, provide an opportunity for offering such courses to reasonably populated classes. They were most effective when taught by competent scholars, least effective when taught by advanced students or native speakers of the target languages with insufficent training and problems in their command of English. Here, too, a rich opportunity for the intensification of language training by providing for the teaching of such courses in the target languages themselves was in the summer of 1964 almost totally neglected.

Such courses need not necessarily be attached each summer to any particular program. To do so would be to increase beyond all limits the already unreasonable demands upon the time and energies of the few competent scholars in these fields now available to American educational institutions. At the same time the survey felt that the emphasis here, as in every other aspect of summer language work, must always be one of quality first, and that given the choice between offering any course, whether language, area or linguistics to be taught by a less than really competent scholar, and not offering it at all, a Center should always be encouraged to choose the second alternative; or by the same token asked to encourage its own students to go elsewhere if another Center provides a satisfactory alternative.

This should not be taken to mean that the survey felt that there was not inherent in intensive summer language programs the possibility of providing teaching experience for the young scholar or even for the advanced student at the dissertation level. Indeed, given the relative abundance of national fellowship and university scholarship funds today, the opportunities for in-service training in classroom teaching for the young scholar in fields associated with the uncommon languages have otherwise all but disappeared. This probably does not serve the best interests either of the persons themselves or of the field, not to mention the national interest. There is an opportunity here in the summer language programs, but it is one that needs to be explored and planned carefully, and one which will be effectively realized only to the extent to which it is provided with adequate supervision and monitoring of performance.

Curiously enough, the survey found that because of what appears to have been simple administrative misjudgment on all sides, the best single

opportunity which the summer of 1964 afforded for staging a joint offering in one of the most neglected of all the neglected languages was totally missed. When the summer of 1964 was still in the planning stage there was the possibility of supporting three intensive programs in Korean. Surely nothing need be added here to underline the urgency of encouraging Korean language studies, in the face of the almost total apathy which even after two decades of deep national involvement both the professional community and students still display here. Two of the proposed summer Korean programs were supported; one was not. The survey revealed that the one program that was not supported almost surely would itself have had four full-time students, none of whom eventually took Korean in the summer after all, while the two programs which were supported eventually shared between themselves a grand total of three other students (and three teachers). A final dimension of improbability is added to this when it is recalled that the two programs eventually supported were at major Centers located close to each other in the same general Eastern seaboard area. (And even though it is beyond the scope of this survey, it must be added that at the same time, still another major university, which is not an NDEA-supported Center, was engaged in dispersing the staff of its own Korean language program because lack of student income and the rejection of all overtures for government support had made it impossible to meet staff salaries -- and this was a program of long standing, involving several trained persons, one of over fifteen years experience in Korean language teaching!). To the members of the survey all the parties participating in this chain reaction of bad decisions which one is tempted to call the "Great Korean Language Fiasco of 1964," seemed equally inefficient. The institution which had four committed summer students in Korean should have seen that they did their work at one of the institutions eventually offering the language.

Furthermore, the government should have considered far more seriously the implications of encouraging new programs while permitting long-established ones to die on the vine. The matter is set forth here at some length only to draw attention to the fact that if the rewards and possibilities of summer language work are great, so are its dangers and difficulties. And there was far too little evidence in this survey of summer, 1964 that the administrative officers in the various Centers were maintaining sufficient communication with each other or, in some cases, even within their own programs to effect fully these inherent possibilities.

The last of these three areas of discussion was concerned with the role and possibilities of the cooperative summer program. At the Bloomington meetings it was possible to draw into those portions of the discussion which dealt chiefly with this problem the invited guests listed above, several of whom have had a wide range of experience in this aspect of summer work. Special attention was given to certain tentative findings based on the several years' experience of a few fairly large-scale cooperative programs involving summer intensive language and area work in both South and Far Eastern languages.

Problems of summer staffing and the severe limitations of the national resource insofar as competent scholars of South Asia is concerned were clearly the main motivating factors in the case of one of these programs. It was noted that these situations differ to a significant extent in the Far Eastern field where motivation was largely a desire to eliminate undue competition for students and, secondarily, for staff. Common to most

cooperative programs also appears to be the conviction that the program as a whole can more successfully secure sufficient financial resources than could any of the participating institutions acting alone.

Areas without a true national language or where the only important language common to the entire area is a modern spoken language common to the entire area is a modern spoken language raise difficult and costly problems which are only partially solved by cooperative ventures. It is necessary at one South Asian Center to offer as many as five or more different languages in a single summer. In this respect a cooperative summer program which must provide for the needs of many students from a variety of institutions sets a monumental task for itself, which is, by the same token, made all the more difficult by differences in methods and goals at the participating institutions. In the case of the cooperative program in South Asian language and area studies which was especially discussed at the Bloomington meetings, effective employment of the audio-lingual method of language instruction appeared to be doing much to meet the special demands put on the program by the nature of the area.

Another important feature in favor of summer cooperative activities, at least in the South Asian field, was their role as intellectual and academic forums and meeting places for scholars and students in the field. Today when so much of the academic year must of necessity be spent in tasks which leave the scholar little time for intellectual growth and stimulating communication with his peers, a cooperative summer program with residence at a common Center and participation by scholars from a variety of institutions, may well be on the way to recreating some of the atmosphere and opportunities which our universities have been forced to surrender. Closely associated with this is the nature of the cooperation itself, which has been most effective when left on the scholar-to-scholar basis with no attempt to legislate or impose standards on the participating institutions or indeed on any institutions.

Further evidence for the effectiveness of cooperative summer programs was considered from Near Eastern and Far Eastern studies. In the Near Eastern field there is now a body of some six years of experience growing out of a cooperative attempt to provide reasonably large summer student populations and, in the process, to eliminate the need for expensive tutorial work at individual institutions. This program has shown a steady growth apart from NDEA support and has afforded the opportunity for training informants and utilizing new audio-lingual teaching materials which have proven to be of benefit to the entire field.

One development of summer cooperative work which was noted with some interest was the concept of intensive language work outside the academic year as "reinforcement" of regular academic-year offerings rather than as a substitute or replacement for them. According to this way of thinking, a student who has done summer language work away from his home institution is simply considered to have spent his summer months reinforcing and supplementing his language skills. When he returns to his campus in September he continues his formal classwork at the same point from which he would go on had he not spent the summer in language work. At first glance this may seem to be a wasteful procedure, but it was felt that in the long run it may well offer the clue both to a more realistic evaluation of summer work and to a solution to many of the difficulties which the summer programs

themselves generate. It arises, of course, primarily in the case of the cooperative summer programs since their student population consists typically of students from institutions which do not themselves offer summer programs. It is in this kind of situation especially that summer work comes to be viewed as a reinforcement for work in the academic year.

The consideration of cooperative programs in summer language work made it clear that if the benefits from such an arrangement are great, the inherent dangers are equally large. The main concern here was one felt for the possiblity of a cooperative summer program becoming an assembly of substandard teaching and inadequate scholarship provided for a large number of students from widely differing institutions. This danger arises chiefly because the pooling of resources implied in a cooperative summer program makes it easy for the more competent scholars and teachers in each cooperating institution to escape from the ardous duties of the summer and for their places to be taken by the less qualified. Gathering together students from a wide variety of institutions also has the very real possibility inherent in it of making the classroom a battleground on which the lowest common denominator of performance and achievement will win out. Careful supervision plus a recognition of accepted standards and goals for each field as a whole will do much, if and when they are achieved, to point the way out of this dilemma.

A cooperative summer language program would also be an ideal theatre of operations in which to stage work in the training of language teachers. If and when this is to be done the problems of standards and quality will be enormous. Especially in the field of Far Eastern languages the present supply of qualified teachers is so critical and the need for more teachers so great that problems in teacher training will take a good deal more time even to approach a solution. The survey felt strongly that to provide teacher training, whether at cooperative summer programs or elsewhere, without sufficient planning and attention to standards would make an already difficult situation even worse.

Many of the advantages which were identified for cooperative intensive summer language programs might equally be argued in favor of academic-year programs. Here the problem takes on another dimension, and we are faced with the basic issue of whether the encouragement of many Centers of widely varying calibre is to take priority over the encouragement of a few first-quality Centers. This is a basic issue which exceeds the limits of the survey and can safely be left for some other occasion.

4. Seven Problem Areas

The survey found that the NDEA-supported intensive summer language programs have, as explained above, been a qualified success; and that while it is clearly necessary to continue their support and the encouragement of intensive summer language work in general for the remainder of this present transitional decade, greater attention should be directed toward seven critical problem areas in evaluating possible future summer programs. Otherwise, the saving of time and other advantages which summer programs may possibly offer will simply not be of the same order of magnitude as the difficulties which they may generate. This section of the report attempts to set forth briefly the dimensions of each of these problem areas in order to provide some background for the recommendations which conclude the report.

(1) The first of these critical areas and one which constantly came to the attention of the survey, both during the visits to Centers and in the course of the Bloomington meetings, is the great need for serious attention to be given to problems of language achievement standards and testing in future summer programs. In fact, the future success of intensive summer language programs may well be largely determined by the speed and skill with which the profession approaches this body of problems. For example, students who have done some work in a language, regardless of how well, how quickly, with what emphasis, or to what purpose were regarded as intermediate language students at virtually all of the Centers visited. When students of a vast variety of backgrounds, experience, language skill and, indeed, language potential are thus grouped together on what is then called the intermediate level, their class work almost invariably was observed to revert to the lowest common denominator in the group.

Put most bluntly, this means that the more comprehensive an intensive summer language program is in the sense of providing work for large numbers of students, the more likely it is that its intermediate work will actually tend to be elementary, and its advanced work, in turn, tend to be on the intermediate level. The general lowering of standards and reduction of achievement goals which this implies are serious problems. The survey noted with relief certain exceptions to this otherwise general pattern. A few Centers administered locally devised but perforce rather parochial tests to incoming intermediate students. At too many Centers, however, what is said to be placement testing turns out on closer inspection to be a short interview in which the student is simply asked on what level he thinks he is, after which he is assigned to that level largely on the basis of his own statement. One Center must be noted here as providing for incoming intermediate students an entire week of "readiness" work in cases where the faculty thought he needed it, on the basis of a serious attempt at testing and evaluation. This week was prior to and in addition to the summer class schedule. There were other exceptions, too, but not enough to remedy a general situation which, unless taken in hand quickly, will surely mean that future summer programs in the uncommon languages will cause more difficulties in this sense than they solve.

The main issue here is the great need for the construction by the language teaching profession of validated, standardized achievement tests for the uncommon languages. These tests presuppose the establishment, again by the profession, of clearly defined achievement goals for these languages. The survey could not but note that in almost all instances the profession, in the summer of 1964, was doing virtually nothing to meet this great need. The one striking exception was in the case of Hindi, where the survey learned of extremely encouraging attempts being made on the scholar-to-scholar level to construct and to validate achievement tests which will make it possible to determine clearly when a student has completed what the profession has defined as the elementary level and when he is sufficiently proficient in the language that his admission to an intermediate or advanced class will not tend to lower the standards of work in those classes. Some fear was felt that in the case of the larger and longer developed fields such as, for example, Chinese and Japanese the development of these standardized achievement tests might be so complicated administratively and academically as to be virtually impossible. But this seems entirely too negative an approach to the problem. The greater the development of the field, the more pressing the problem of achievement test development is, and it would be only a step backward to avoid the issue because of its dimensions. It was clear to the survey that the work of a number of scholars associated with the teaching of Hindi at several Centers should be studied closely in the future with a view to encouraging similar activities in achievement test development on the part of other language teachers.

In the present almost complete absence of achievement standards and testing for the uncommon languages, the intermediate courses have become catchalls, and admission to them is sometimes little more than a reward for time spent in some other less effective classroom situation. Perhaps solution to problems of this variety can be encouraged by government support for the development and validation of standardized achievement tests. But the survey felt that the sources of support for such work were less important than the need for a clear realization on the part of the profession that a simple interview or trial-and-error placement almost always does considerable damage both to students and to program. And experience on the part of several of the members of the survey with some of the monumental difficulties which adumbrate such work if approached through professional associations or societies, or on the institutional level, made the group feel strongly that the Hindi scholars were pointing in the correct direction whith their scholar-to-scholar attempts.

In setting standards and goals it will be necessary for the profession eventually to come to grips with the problem of the ultimate goal in language work -- is the student to become literate or articulate? This is primarily a question for the academic year programs, and the direction towards which they point must be followed in summer work. With it must also be considered the role of oral work and work in spoken language in those instances where the ultimate target is skill in handling written records, often in a non-vernacular variety of the language. Research and controlled experimentation are vitally needed in all these areas; the summer program urgently needs the results of such studies but cannot by its nature be the area in which they are effectively carried out.

(2) The second principal area of problems which continues to qualify the success of some summer language programs is that relating to the equivalence, or as it is often termed, the articulation of summer language programs with the academic year. In no area of the survey were the great discrepancies and amazing differences in level and quality of work offered at the various Centers more apparent. With the best will in the world it became difficult for the survey members as they visited various Centers even to take seriously the obviously well-meant statements on the part of certain directors and many language teachers that the work at their Center in their summer program was surely equivalent to a total academic year. For example, one member of the survey wrote in his detailed report after a visit to Center X as follows: "Most of the instructors at this Center feel that their summer program could quite well substitute for the regular academic year program, but it is hard to say on exactly what evidence they base themselves. None of the instructors employed at this Center during the summer, with the exception of two individuals, had or will have a regular appointment at the Center during the academic year. Thus not only did most of the students come from different campuses but so did most of the instructors. What yardstick or measuring device was used for their statements concerning articulation? If, for example, a count of the number of characters taught in first year Chinese is used, the variation is simply extraordinary. The students came, from among other places, from Centers Y and Z. Center Y claimed to have taught 950 Chinese characters in 10 weeks, Center Z only 150, whereas last year at Center X two different sections of the same elementary Chinese course were said to have varied between 700 and 450. Figures for the academic year experiences were, when available, even more scattered. For an outsider the criteria of judgment employed concerning a summer's worth in terms of the academic year remain totally obscure." As also, the survey suspected, they must for the present remain for the insider as well. Granted that the number of Chinese characters taught or the number of Chinese characters to which the student is exposed is in itself an undefined and almost untestable type of criterion, it is still sufficient to show the near chaos which obtains in the field at present.

Loose usage of the terms "intensive" and "semi-intensive" have added to the confusion. As already indicated, the survey tended to define "intensive" as a chronological descriptive for a summer language course meaning a course which requires virtually all of the student's time, more or less without regard for the number of so-called contact hours per week. (This is to be carefully distinguished from a definition of "intensive" as a factor in language teaching methodology where it does not refer to the number of hours spent on a language but to the nature of the work done during those hours. To this point we shall return later below.) Intensive is in this sense based on the principle that the fewer the classroom contact hours, the more outside preparation including language laboratory work must be required of the student, and hence the course will be one which requires virtually all of his time. "Semi-intensive," a term which has recently come into considerable popularity, is generally thought of as a nine- or ten-hour per week academic year course, or what is called at some institutions a double course. (It should be noted that the "intensive" in the expression "semi-intensive" is solely in reference to factors of time and contact hours and has no implications concerning teaching method. As far as teaching method is concerned, no course can be "semi-intensive.") And although they are admittedly few and far between, academic-year offerings still survive in the uncommon languages based on the

old three- or four-hour per week "Monday, Wednesday, Friday" pattern of academic-year language instruction.

All of this means that in the virtual absence of standardized achievement tests and validated means of determining levels of skill and progress in a language, statements that this or that course at a Center is equivalent to a full-year's work at this or that Center were almost without exception found to be totally meaningless. The only level on which they had any significance at all was probably that of course titles and credit numbers recorded on transcripts. Thus it was generally unexpectedly difficult for the survey to determine exactly how far the summer language programs came toward meeting academic-year standards or how far below they fell or, as even seemed possible in a few cases, how far they exceeded these standards. This area of difficulty was already discussed in 1962 in Axelrod and Bigelow's Resources for Language and Area Studies, but the survey could not locate much evidence that the profession has to date treated it seriously enough.

This problem is also aggravated by and associated with that of teaching materials (for which see under (5) below). and seemed especially acute in the case of Chinese and Japanese. Uncommon though these languages may be in the sense of the title of this report, they are now widely taught using what can only be described as a bewildering variety of teaching materials. Articulation problems are perhaps the least of those arising from this situation but they are important. One important Center, to suggest still another problem, uses both in its academic year and in its summer work a body of Chinese teaching materials which, while excellent in every way and well adapted to the needs of this Center, is used by hardly any other Center in the country. The problems which arise when this Center offers elementary intensive Chinese in the summer are obvious. There is no question here of the propriety of their text selection, only of the propriety of this Center's offering elementary intensive summer work to any but its own academic-year students.

If the urgency of this set of problems can also be communicated to the academic-year programs, summer language work will have done a great deal toward improving and rationalizing virtually all the offerings in the uncommon languages now available in American educational institutions.

(3) Closely associated with the above is the problem of the proper and necessary length for an intensive summer language program. The actual offerings in the summer of 1964 ranged from six through twelve weeks. Again in view of this fact it was difficult to take at face value the assurances often extended that a six-week course for three hours a day was equal to a six-week course for six hours a day was equal to a ten- or twelve-week course for two or three or five hours a day was equal to an academic year of Monday, Wednesday, Friday or a semi-intensive or genuinely intensive academic year course, etc., etc. In the absence of recognized standards the length of the summer course is simply another distracting factor in an otherwise sufficiently discouraging and bewildering situation.

However, the survey felt strongly that one way to begin to rise above this confusion would be to agree upon ten weeks as the necessary minimum for a summer language intensive course. Few Centers will wish to elect a twelve-week summer course but perhaps some few always should. But if even a beginning is ever to be made toward academic year and summer program equivalence, it must

be made along the lines of a ten-week summer program. If university administrative procedures or other formal considerations on the campus of a given Center make it impossible to offer a ten-week summer language program there, the survey felt that such a Center would best be advised to forgo the opportunity of offering a summer program. Nothing can justify using administrative difficulties as an excuse for lowering standards or turning out dozens of students who feel that they have had the equivalent of a full year of some uncommon language but who have really had but a smattering.

There are exceptions, of course, to this admittedly hard line which the survey found it necessary to adopt with respect to the length of summer work for most of the uncommon languages. With Portuguese, for example, six weeks seemed quite sufficient at the Centers visited. The language is rarely done by anyone without a background in Spanish; its orthography offers no difficulties; and six weeks seems a reasonable length for summer programs in this or in other languages which might present a similar happy conjunction of circumstances. But for those languages which the student approaches with no background at all and where in many cases the orthography makes great demands upon the student's time, and this means most of the uncommon ones, it is clearly necessary in planning future intensive summer language programs to think in terms of ten full weeks, preferably exclusive of holidays and examination time, or nothing.

(4) How many hours and with what materials a language is taught are problems that are actually secondary; the heart of the matter is how the language is taught. It was in the area of language teaching methodology that the members of the survey found most to interest them in their visits to the Centers, and it was also to this set of problems that they devoted the major part of their time at the Bloomington meetings. Their findings were diverse but showed amazing agreement on the existence of a great problem here and the need for speedy action. before another year's summer language program is set in motion.

To understand the situation which the survey found in the summer of 1964, it is necessary to go back for a brief historical review. Without attempting either a detailed or a documented account we may remind ourselves that down to the beginning of World War II most languages, whether common or uncommon, were taught in American educational institutions by what is now generally called the grammar, reading and translation method. The term lists the main operations to which classroom time was largely devoted. During World War II, under the stimulus of the national need for large numbers of people with practical training in foreign languages and under the direction of the community of linguistic scholarship, the grammar, reading and translation method was largely abandoned in favor of a new one, and it was along the lines of this new method that the nation was able to provide effective language instruction for large numbers of military and other vital personnel. The new techniques, practices, and theories of language teaching which were thus set into operation have been called by many names by both friend and foe alike; for the purpose of this report, the survey decided to adopt the term "audio-lingual." This term identifies what can be most briefly described as that body of language teaching, theory and practice which evolved in American education in the latter half of World War II; for documentation and details see the partial bibliography which lists, among other items, some of the basic

works on this method and which appears as Appendix II to the present report. In this connection, the important section on the audio-lingual method in Axelrod and Bigelow's contribution should not be overlooked.

The audio-lingual method is based more than anything else on a clear and rational division of labor in all teaching contact situations between a person with training in linguistics, in language teaching and in the language being taught on the one hand, and a person whose task it is to provide specimens of the target language through oral drills, repetitious practicing of patterns, graded conversations and the like on the other. The first person is usually referred to as the linguist, while the second person is variously referred to as the native speaker, informant, drill master, etc. The work of the second person may be shared, amplified and reinforced by audio-visual equipment, notably the so-called language laboratory, which can become a mechanical extension of him and his work. It is possible for both these functions to be exercised by a single individual. But since the method has at its heart the clear division of labor implied by two functions and two persons, that which is sometimes spoken of as an ideal, which is to say the linguistically trained native speaker who is able not only to offer and drill the students in specimens of the language but also to present meaningful statements in English about their structure and meaning is theoretically questionable. Be that as it may, the audio-lingual method is based on the work of a linguist, who talks about the language as little as possible but to that extent necessary to reassure the students and to assure that they do not lose contact with meaning, and the native speaker whose work it is, under the immediate and constant supervision of the linguist, to provide intensive exposure to and opportunities for practice in the target language.

This method, to some extent or other, was adopted in American education on many levels at the conclusion of World War II since its practical advantages over the old grammar, reading and translation method were too obvious to be ignored. The term "intensive" as a methodological criterion rather than as a chronological descriptive refers to the audio-lingual method and emphasizes the fact that the work of the linguist and the work of the native speaker reinforce, which is to say, complement or "intensify" each other. This is why an audio-lingual course is intensive; not because it is taught for a large number of hours per day (though that is always necessary), or even, as one student interviewed by a survey member suggested, because it tends to make both students and teachers "tense."

The audio-lingual method, like any other body of theory and practice in education, needs constant validation and development on every level. Such work has been going on at a few institutions ever since the conclusion of World War II. Texts designed for use in the method have appeared, most of them growing out of Office of Education contracts with university Centers. Both the experience of the profession and the literature of the field give no indication that any of the basic propositions of the method have been successfully challenged or basically altered over the past two decades.

In view of this, the survey was astonished to find that with only a few significant exceptions the NDEA-sponsored language courses as observed in the summer of 1964 had virtually abandoned the audio-lingual method. Nothing could be found of it in most of the Centers visited except the terminology -- words like linguist, native informant, drill master and drill

section were found in abundant use. But the functions properly associated with these terms have generally been lost sight of. The method was seen to be surviving in most cases only as a set of terminological gimmicks; the names and the terms were those of the audio-lingual method but the substance of the teaching was grammar, reading and translation.

The survey, having reached this discouraging conclusion, devoted some time to an attempt to determine how this strange miscarriage of principals had come about. More than anything else it seems to have been a result of administrative neglect and of a serious shortage of persons with linguistic training. The first of these two factors is probably the more important since one of the great strengths and advantages of the audio-lingual method is that in a field where trained people have always been scarce, and will continue to be for some time, it makes a little go a long way. One linguist can supervise a good deal of classroom work by native speakers, and native speakers can be trained effectively and can work economically under his direction. What seems most difficult of solution is the problem which arises when a language program, whether summer or academic year, is administered by a person without linguistic training, and when native speakers take on the function of the linguist without the necessary training and background. Throughout the summer language programs visited, it was observed time and time again that the native speakers are not, if we may use the phrase, speaking native; they are providing lengthy and generally pointless discussions about the language, they are explaining grammar or what they think of as grammar in terms of English translation equivalents, and they are using up the few valuable hours that a summer language program provides without providing the student with the opportunity either to hear the language or to learn to use it.

At some of the Centers visited the lack of communication between the so-called linguist, if one there was, and the native speakers who were supposed to be providing drill sessions under his direction was almost beyond belief. One such person supposedly in charge of several native speakers assisting him in an elementary intensive course had never visited a single one of his drill sessions. He had made no attempt either to train or to supervise the native speakers with whom he was working. When asked what happened in the several hours each day which his class spent with the native speakers he replied, "since the summer is so tiring I assume they spend it in relaxed conversation." The visit to this Center, like many others, showed that actually his choice of expression here was quite accurate. Relaxed conversation in English is precisely what far too many of the so-called drill sessions or other periods with native speakers were found to be in the summer of 1964.

It would, of course, be a gross injustice not to point out that at several Centers visited there was abundant evidence that here and there in the total summer language program the audio-lingual method was not only still being employed but being employed with imagination, energy and success. The work in uncommon African languages, for example, gave evidence of this, as did much of the work in South and Southeast Asian languages and some in Portuguese and Russian. The survey seemed to feel that there was some direct relationship between the size of a field of study, the number of students studying the language, its extent of permeation into the American academic curriculum and other such factors with whether or not the audio-lingual method was honored in fact or merely in name.

Clearly the most striking and wide-spread abandonment of the method was to be observed in the widely taught and, in theory at least, best established programs in Far Eastern languages. Here, too, there were exceptions. One remarkably effective program in elementary Japanese was noted; but such exceptions were rare enough so that they stood out all the more. As one member of the survey team put it, "one need not even look for long-range conclusions on relative effectiveness when the method is employed as against when it is abandoned. One has only to compare the attitudes and performance of students who, after adequate linguistic explanation and preparation, are working actively and eagerly under a trained, efficient native speaker with the listless, bored and pointless expressions on the faces of students in a drill session which has abandoned language work in favor of digressions on differences between Oriental and Western thought, the scenery of old Peking, reminiscences of a Japanese childhood and other irrelevancies." Here, as often, the students can evidently be better evaluators than the administrators.

Clearly the goals of the NDEA, inasmuch as they are in the process of being implemented by summer language work, will be detracted from rather than enhanced until vigorous steps can be taken to restore the best possible teaching methods to intensive summer language programs. How this is to be done lies somewhat beyond the scope of this report except as it is touched upon below under recommendations. But that it must be done before another summer's program begins was the clear consensus of the survey.

(5) The teaching materials observed in the survey were as varied as the programs themselves. In many cases their utilization presupposes effective application of the audio-lingual method since this was the method for which they have been designed. Recent years have seen the growth of a considerable corpus of such audio-lingual oriented materials, and the few instances observed where summer Centers were actually employing both the theory and substance of the method found these new materials enjoying exceptionally effective and rewarding classroom use. When, on the other hand, the classroom practices had reverted in all but name to grammar, reading and translations, these materials of course came out very badly. So the problem here is clearly secondary to that discussed above under method. Given an effective teaching methodology, the requirement for materials which will suit it is obvious. Without the methodology no materials can save the day no matter how well designed they may be.

The one single area in which the survey noted a genuine and cumulative sense of progress over the past several years as that of so-called language laboratory. This is actually not as the name implies a laboratory, but in most cases a multiple listening or multiple recording and listening arrangement by means of which certain of the repetitive and stimulus-response roles of the native speaker can safely be assigned to mechanical devices. Curiously enough the language laboratories, perhaps because of their mechanical novelty, interest most people in charge of summer language programs more than does the work of the native speaker who in general seems to have lost his glamour and to have been left to go his own way. In almost all the programs visited, language laboratory facilities were adequate to excellent; their utilization was commendable; and the materials were by and large well designed.

The survey's concern with materials brought out one fairly wide-spread practice which it seemed to all the members of the survey needs careful attention. This is the growing tendency for language teachers specifically

for some of the largely untrained native speakers of the language, to prepare their own materials and to use summer language programs as a testing ground for them. In African or East and Southeast Asian languages, where no satisfactory materials exist, such is often an unavoidable course of action. But it takes a heavy toll of both teacher and student, and it is difficult to justify in better-developed fields where there are now abundant well-designed elementary and intermediate teaching materials. In addition to the burden which it places on teacher and student, it means that at best the student completing the course has completed a curriculum whose content and achievement level will be totally off the record as far as any other institution is concerned. Hence the already critical problem of levels and standards is, to no point at all, given still another level of complexity.

Much of the motivation for this wide-spread practice of haphazard and frivolous preparation of new teaching materials appears actually to be motivated by non-educational and non-linguistic factors. Too often it comes about solely because the language teacher, insecure in his profession and seeking some way of enhancing his professional standing, feels that producing publishable material is the only way to advance himself. But in thus attempting to conform to academic custom he finds himself at a great disadvantage because, being trained in no discipline, he has nothing about which he can publish the usual articles or books which are counted toward promotions and appointments. So it is perhaps only natural that if left to his own devices he hits upon what seems to him the happy expedient of turning out ten or twenty elementary lessons, often little more than specimens of connected text, in his own language.

The easy access which our culture enjoys to methods for the rapid duplication of written matter means that a few hours with pen or typewriter and stencil can produce a considerable corpus of such materials at low cost both in money and effort; but the cost to the student who is subjected to them is often high. Clearly this is simply another specific instance of insufficient supervision of native informant and drill masters by linguists and administrators. The audio-lingual method, like any other method, must use the best materials available, and when good materials are readily available it is folly and unfair to the students to use the programs and their facilities for such trivial ends as described here.

(6) Much has already been said on the subject of instructional staff, but further statements must be added here. Summer language programs make a tremendous and even cruel demand on staff in every sense of the word. With the inevitable shift of American higher education to a twelve-month operation, the universities are obviously in the process of solving this dilemma, for when the summer session becomes simply one of the four terms or semesters of the new long academic year, summer teaching will benefit from the rotational provisions for faculty and staff which the twelve-month operation has as one of its essentials. Until that time, however, the problem remains an acute one.

For the competent scholar time spent teaching in an intensive summer language program is not only generally time wasted but time which he can not possibly recover in terms of the salary he is paid. The instructor or assistant professor who spends ten weeks teaching in an intensive summer language program, even if he received five times the salary which he will get, will still eventually end up out of pocket if we think of what he has passed up by not spending the same ten weeks studying, writing articles, or otherwise advancing his career.

A few hundred dollars in summer earnings or even a few thousand simply cannot be balanced against the eventual loss of many thousands if the practice of summer language teaching goes on year after year. Given this reality, it was discouraging to learn how many comparatively young scholars feel that they must teach in summer programs, even though they know they should not, because of personal pressures brought to bear by Center directors eager to line up the best staff possible.

In this connection it must be noted that the institutions at which Centers are located have made little if any progress in recognizing and rewarding effective language teaching as distinct from scholarship. The effective language teacher still seeks in vain the rewards, both in salary and in prestige, which are his due, and until the universities evolve methods of providing them such teachers will continue to be few and far between.

It was also discouraging to see that there is a large market for sub-standard scholarship and language teaching for which the summer is the most advantageous employment period. The abundance of fellowship help for competent students and research funds for competent scholars today has brought the profession virtually to a point where anyone who will teach in the summer must be suspect.

What is the way out of these several dilemmas? One which has already been suggested will automatically come about with the growth in frequency of the twelve-month academic year. Another is closely connected with what has been said above concerning the audio-lingual method. The Center director who is faced with a large enrollment, for example in elementary Chinese, will find it impossible to provide for ten sections of classroom work each taught by a competent scholar. The people do not exist in such numbers and if they did they would have better things to do. If he is lucky and if he is willing to give in return for what he gets in tuition income, he may be able to engage one competent person to fulfill the linguist's role in the audio-lingual method; and he will have no trouble at all in locating any number of native speakers who can be trained on fairly short notice to do the classroom drills and other informant work. In this way the re-emergence of the audio-lingual method which this report hopes to encourage would do much to solve staff problems. Many Centers talk feelingly of their staff problems as if it were either possible or desirable to train hundreds of native speakers to be linguists and, by implication, hundreds of linguists to be native speakers. The confusion of these two roles has lead to further chaos in the staffing situation, and improvement in one can hardly come about without improvement in the other. Here again, as already noted under method and materials, the smaller newer language programs seem in better shape even though we might expect that their staffing problems would be the more acute.

One of the most curious miscarriages of principles noted was that observed at several Centers regarding the use of Americans or other persons not native speakers but trained in the target language in comparison with the use of native speakers. The principles of the audio-lingual method and our experience over the past two decades would naturally assign important roles in the elementary and early intermediate stages of language instruction to the non-native speaker with skill in the target language. As the students gained in skill and as, by the same token, the materials taught became more complex his work would be scaled down in phase with the growing importance

of the work of the native speaker. Thus on the advanced levels the class work could be conducted in the target language by the native speaker and the students would be able to work virtually without the intermediaries, either of their own language or of linguistic and other explanations. This last stage would be especially useful, for example, in Chinese and Japanese where the ultimate goals involve written materials of great difficulty in orthographies of considerable complexity.

What has happened in many Centers, however, is exactly the opposite of this ideal. The non-native speaker, often a person with enviable fluency in the language, is employed on the lower levels simply because no competent linguistic direction is available and the native speaker is not able to keep order and satisfy the student's requests for information in English at the beginning levels. The native speakers are employed more and more on the intermediate and curiously enough also on the advanced levels, but here they are found to be spending almost all their time not in providing specimens of and stimuli in the target language but in attempting to guide the students in translation into English. Particularly in Chinese and Japanese, the native speaker has now virtually monopolized teaching translation into English.

Translation into English is a vital discipline for students in the uncommon languages. It is also a much neglected one. There is no body of theory and practice now in existence for classroom exercise in English translation comparable to the audio-lingual method for elementary and intermediate work in spoken and beginning written language. As it finds its way into our classrooms today, it is simply a ghost from our grammar, reading and translation past. It is the only one of that ancient triad that deserves a place in our modern classroom, but it is one which has yet to undergo the rehabilitation necessary to fit it for a place in the modern world. In the absence of a theoretical and methodological basis much of the teaching of translation is necessarily self-defeating. Ideally, effective classroom work in translation presupposes a teacher who is equally fluent in both languages. But this means bilingualism, and true bilingualism is a pathological linguistic condition. So practically we must learn to make do with people who have complete fluency in one language and considerable fluency in the other. For translation work the greater fluency should not be in the target language but in the first language of the persons to whom translation is being taught. Much of the advanced translation work observed by the survey found native speakers valiantly pushing their own command of English to the breaking point in an attempt to give students some understanding of the often extremely difficult texts being read. In Many cases their energy was commendable and their command of English surprisingly good; but in few if any cases could they be said to be accomplishing more than a discussion of the text in English on secondary or tertiary levels. Most of the questions which their students raise in class are not really language learning questions but questions which arise because of the structure of English, from English semantic configurations, and because of interference which arises between these systems and parallel systems in the target language. The native speaker should be encouraged to do what he does best, and with very few exceptions this is not translation into English.

The teaching of pronunciation was observed to be generally neglected, and urgent work is indicated here, both to save the current crop of language students and to educate and re-train the present teachers. Few classes indeed were observed in which the native speakers were correcting or drilling

pronunciation. Careless and inaccurate pronunciation and uncorrected use of English sounds in speaking the target language were observed widely, almost irrespective of field. Sometimes these difficulties were complicated by earlier language instruction. Students had often first been allowed to gain some fluency in speaking Spanish or Russian with incorrect pronunciation, using virtually all English sounds, and were now observed practicing Portuguese or Polish with what they regard as Spanish or Russian sounds, but which were actually only their own incorrect versions of these sounds. In second foreign language situations of this kind, correction of pronunciation in the new language is probably difficult without remedial work in the second language. Essentially the problem goes back to the earlier training, and the survey was again reminded of the great need for more effective foreign language teaching on the high school level. But in other instances it was also noted that few summer Center programs had pronunciation clinics or other special help for students in this connection, and that many of the instructors, particularly the native speakers, were insufficiently trained in this respect.

Closely allied with all aspects of summer staff problems is the problem of the size of classes and drill sections. Perhaps one reason that the audio-lingual method has become so largely neglected is to be found in the grossly swollen classes which were generally observed at the larger Centers. Often Center directors explained that on the first day of the session student enrollment had turned out to be much greater than they had planned. Twenty or more students were sometimes attempting to do drills and other individual participation work of a variety that cannot possibly be performed with any efficiency by more than six or seven people at one time. To be sure, attempting to estimate enrollment figures in advance is hazardous and frustrating for the administrator; and staff size must and should depend on enrollment. Here again the problems are in direct proportion to the extent to which the audio-lingual method has been abandoned, or is being followed. It is possible, by a serious attempt at a carefully coordinated course employing close linguistic supervision of the work of trained native speakers, to stay abreast of student enrollment. With the increase in tuition income which such gratifyingly large enrollments imply for the Center institutions, there can be little excuse for attempting to accomplish with from fifteen to twenty or more people what it is difficult enough to do with six or seven.

Some way must also be found in many of the larger Centers to bring the work and the skills of their more effective teachers to bear on the performance of their less effective colleagues. It is difficult to conceive of any significant nation-wide raising of standards when it still seems to be most difficult to raise standards institution-wide. One of the many irrelevant factors which appears to get into the way here is a lingering echo of the principle of academic freedom. Many Center directors and other persons in charge of language courses seemed to imply that they felt any attempt to supervise language teaching and to bring the poorer of their teachers up to the level of the best of them would somehow be a violation of the teacher's human or academic rights. All that is being violated as a result of their indifference is the student's undeniable right to effective teaching in return for his tuition paid.

At one Center an over-enrolled elementary Chinese class had been split by the alphabet evenly between two teachers, both native speakers. One was a brilliant classroom teacher, able to work effectively with small groups perhaps

one-third the size of the one which actually turned up. Especially with the assistance of a linguist, who here was missing, this kind of teacher was one who could have insured that the class would achieve respectable goals and standards of accomplishment. The other half of the enrollment went automatically to a person who has not only a totally different personality but a remarkably ineffective classroom teacher. Here were two groups of students who, simply for the fault of the initial of their last names, would or would not at the end of the summer have managed to learn quite a bit of Chinese. Even at the time the program was visited the difference in levels of accomplishment of the two groups had already become obvious; by the end of the summer it was without a doubt like night and day. Even granted the necessity of employing the least effective of these two teachers, closer coordination between the two sections than was in evidence would at least have provided emergency alleviation of the problem.

(7) The last important group of problems can be summarized by the statement that there are certain activities and courses of instruction which are better adapted for presentation in the summer than are others. Foremost among these are probably the "tool function" intensive language courses for students who are not now majoring in or planning future advanced work in language or literature but who must acquire sufficient ability to use written materials and, in many cases, to conduct field work in the areas relevant to their studies.

A second variety of work which appears to have a particular suitability for summer programming consists of the advanced, specialized courses which make it possible for interested students to work with one or two scholars in the field who otherwise would be restricted to their own campuses in the academic year. *Such courses in the summer not only insure the most efficient use* of manpower and financial resources, but since they are advanced and specialized they cause few if any articulation problems. Finally, there are important but necessarily small courses even on the elementary or intermediate levels which are necessary for certain students and indeed for the national interest but which can be offered successfully in terms of competent staff and reasonable student population only from time to time at carefully selected Centers. Summer provides an excellent opportunity for work of this kind, both in certain specific languages and in certain particular language skills.

5. Recommendations

The survey from its beginning was asked to attempt to evolve recommendations for both institutional and public policy with reference to intensive summer language programs. Many of its recommendations are already implicit in the report thus far, but it may be useful in conclusion to bring together here in more concise form certain specific items which appeared to the members of the survey team to merit particular attention.

To the best of survey's understanding of the process by which summer activities of the NDEA-supported Centers have come into existence and are presently planned and carried out, the critical point at which recommendations based on this survey can best be implemented seemed almost without question to be the evaluation of the competitive proposals for summer programs now submitted by the Centers each year. Since each of these competitive proposals must be evaluated by the government before the necessary support can be authorized, it is probably here that the various widely dispersed elements of summer language programs can most effectively be brought under coherent control.

For this reason the survey strongly recommends to the government that more information be required from the Center directors in their proposals for summer work than has been the case previously; that this information cover certain aspects of summer work which will insure a satisfactory basis for an evaluation of such summer work; and that in all cases a serious attempt be made to improve the standards of summer language work and to redirect it along the lines suggested in this survey by channeling support into those programs which seem most likely to move in the indicated directions.

This is no radical departure from current practice except in degree. When some time ago the government required that all Centers planning summer work include at least "one elementary intensive language course" it was then setting up standards of performance and prescribing specific methods, if not content, of instruction. The difficulty has been neither with the intention nor the language of this stipulation but, as this survey has found, in the extremely varied and often unsatisfactory implementation of this stipulation at the Centers. If it is possible for the government to require "one elementary intensive course" then it is also equally possible for the government to require in the proposals sufficient information so that it can assure itself within reasonable limits that this and other courses will actually be taught in the way desired.

To this end it is specifically recommended that in the evaluation of summer language proposals for 1965 and in awarding support for their proposed activities, priority be given to proposed programs whose directors submit as a part of their proposal sufficient data, documented according to their own wishes, to give evidence of the following:

(1) That serious attention will be paid to implementation of the audio-lingual method of instruction for all elementary language classes and as far as possible for all intermediate language classes. Intensive is to be

understood as that method of full-time language instruction which employs the audio-lingual method. A proposal might, for example, effectively document its plan to utilize this method by providing the government with a daily schedule for the proposed class work showing specifically which hours will be spent with the linguist or other trained supervisor of the course work, which hours will be spent in drills and practice with native speakers, what these drills and practices will consist of, what hours will be spent with language laboratory facilities, and the like. The greater the detail which can be supplied at this stage of the proposal, the more effective the government's evaluation of it can be. For example, simply to state that one or more hours a day are to be spent in "conversation" or "drill" would be of little utility. For a suggested sample of the type of documentation which will be useful in this connection, see Appendix III.

(2) That staff will be adequate and competent. The proposals should go into greater detail than hitherto in the identification of staff members whose support is suggested for summer work. They should state clearly whether the staff members named have had their summer 1965 services contracted for at the time of the submission of the proposal, or whether they are still only under negotiation. Their listing should include their past experience identified as to Center and course in earlier summer language programs. Staff members proposed for area, linguistic and supervisory work should have listings which include not only their practical experience but some indication of their academic background and interests. The information supplied in the proposals for native speakers and informants need be less complete but should always indicate clearly to whom in the program they will be directly responsible. Priority should be given to programs whose summer work will be carried on largely by academic-year staff either from the Center in question or from institutions closely associated with the work of the Center or in some way cooperating with it in language and area studies.

(3) That the teaching materials will be satisfactory. The materials proposed to be used in each class for which support is asked should be described fully. If they are published materials known to the profession a bibliographical citation will suffice, but it should be completed with a note showing how much of the materials is to be covered each week of the proposed program, and also their assignment with respect to the various hours of class work as set forth under (1) immediately above.

The survey strongly felt that summer programs are not the place in which to introduce or experiment with untried or improvised materials. If a program proposes using such materials in the summer of 1965 it should set forth its reasons in considerable detail and submit with each copy of the proposal a single copy of at least half of the improvised materials proposed. In extremely new and under-developed fields such as the African or certain of the Southeast Asian languages, this last requirement may on prior consultation be waived, but it should be rigidly adhered to in all other cases.

(4) That students with previous language work will be carefully placed. Each proposal should give concrete evidence that students at the intermediate levels and above and all other students joining the program with previous language work will be carefully tested and screened with respect to their present achievement levels before being assigned to any except elementary

beginning work. A brief but concrete description of what kind of testing will be done, who will do it, and when it will be done, must be included. The proposal will be considerably strengthened if a specimen of the test or tests to be administered is attached to each copy.

(5) That serious attention will be paid to the problems of summer and academic-year articulation. Intensive summer language programs for less than ten full weeks will not be encouraged or considered suitable for support. Exceptions will be made after prior consultation for programs in Portuguese or for certain well-established special programs in Russian, but the ten-week rule will otherwise be strictly adhered to.

Ideally, a proposed schedule should indicate ten five-day weeks of classroom contact, a total of fifty days exclusive of holidays and examinations. For elementary intensive language courses the minimum time for classroom contact with linguists and native speakers should be four fifty-minute periods each day or its equivalent, plus time in the language laboratory or other supervised study and exercises as determined by the nature of staff and materials proposed.

(6) In addition, if a Center wishes to propose area or content courses in addition to intensive language work, it should be made clear exactly which segment of the student population they are aimed at and how they will reinforce language training. Prior consideration for support will be given to programs whose area or other content offerings are taught in an uncommon language or are in some other way closely integrated with the language program. Staff proposed for these courses should be carefully identified as under (2) above.

(7) Finally, each proposal should contain a brief statement of over-all purpose, setting forth in specific terms the reason why the director of the Center feels it will be necessary for his Center to stage a summer program in 1965 and why the courses proposed should be given at his particular Center. Here the Center director can use his knowledge of the field as a whole and of his own Center to provide the government with valuable data and to assist it in avoiding duplication and waste. These statements of purpose will be useful to the extent that they avoid generalities and concentrate on the specific program needs of specific students known to the Center director.

It is recommended that the above seven items are to be submitted as part of each summer 1965 proposal, in addition to the fiscal and other administrative data which has hitherto constituted these proposals. It is hoped that careful study of the next year's proposals, documented by data along the above lines, will make it possible for government awards in support of next summer's activities to benefit from the findings of this survey of the 1964 intensive summer language programs.

Appendix I

The NDEA-Supported Summer 1964 Intensive Language Programs

Institution & Summer Director	Languages
University of California Berkeley, California (Prof. Gerald D. Berreman, Summer Director, South Asia Language and Area Center)	Bengali, Hindi-Urdu, Sanskrit, Tamil, Telugu
University of California Los Angeles, California (Prof. Wolf Leslau, Summer Director, Near Eastern Language and Area Center)	Amharic, Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Hebrew, Kabyle, Persian, Turkish
University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado (Prof. Donald S. Willis, Summer Director, Center for Slavic and East European Studies)	Chinese, Japanese
Columbia University New York, New York (Prof. Wm. Theodore de Bary, Summer Director, East Asian Language and Area Center)	Cantonese Chinese, Japanese Korean, Mandarin Chinese
Columbia University New York, New York (Prof. Harold B. Segel, Summer Director, Soviet and East European Language and Area Center)	Polish, Russian
Cornell University Ithaca, New York (Prof. George McT. Kahin, Summer Director, Southeast Asia Language and Area Center	Indonesian, Thai, Vietnamese
Duke University Durham, North Carolina (Prof. Robert O. Swan Summer Director, Center for Southern Asian Studies)	Hindi-Urdu

Institution & Summer Director	Languages
Duquesne University Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Prof. Geza Grosschmid, Summer Director, African Language and Area Center)	Bambara, Hausa, Igbo, Swahili, Yoruba
Fordham University New York, New York (Rev. Walter C. Jaskievicz, S.J., Summer Director, Russian Language and Area Center)	Lithuanian, Polish, Russian
Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts (Prof. James R. Hightower, Summer Director, Language and Area Center for East Asian Studies)	Chinese, Japanese, Korean
Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts (Prof. George M. Makdisi, Summer Director, Center for Middle Eastern Studies)	Arabic, Hebrew, Iranian, Persian, Syrian
University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii (Prof. Ronald S. Anderson, Summer Director, Asian Language and Area Center)	Chinese, Hindi, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Thai
Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana (Prof. William B. Edgerton, Summer Director, Slavic Language and Area Center)	Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian
University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas (Prof. Jerzy Krzyzanowski, Summer Director, Center for East Asian Studies)	Polish, Russian
The University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan (Prof. John Mersereau, Jr. Summer Director, Slavic Language and Area Center)	Polish, Russian

Institution & Summer Director	Languages
New York University New York, New York (Prof. John Edwin Fagg, Summer Director, Portuguese Language and Area Center)	Portuguese
University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Prof. W. Norman Brown, Summer Director, South Asia Language and Area Center)	Hindi-Urdu, Sanskrit, Tamil
University of Southern California Los Angeles, California (Prof. Theodore H.E. Chen, Summer Director, Soviet-Asian Studies Center)	Chinese, Japanese
Stanford University Stanford, California (Prof. Donald H. Shively, Summer Director, Chinese-Japanese Language and Area Center)	Chinese, Japanese
Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana (Prof. Bernard Gicovate, Summer Director, Language and Area Center for Latin American Studies)	Portuguese
University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah (Prof. Aziz S. Atiya, Summer Director, Middle Eastern Language and Area Center)	Arabic
The University of Wisconsisn Madison, Wisconsin (Prof. Alberto Machado da Rosa, Summer Director, Language and Area Center for Latin American Studies)	Portuguese

Appendix II

Bibliography

Angiolillo, Paul F. Armed Forces Foreign Language Teaching. New York: Vanni, 1947.

The overall nature of the World War II armed forces language-training program with particular reference to the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP); a consideration of several critical evaluations of it; its theories, methods, and significance for language training in general.

Axelrod, Joseph and Bigelow, Donald M. Resources for Language and Area Studies. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962.

An inventory of NDEA-sponsored language and area centers in operation during the academic year 1960-61; the center concept; resources and practices; future life of the centers; the audio-lingual approach in college and university language teaching.

Bloch, Bernard and Trager, George L. Outline of Linguistic Analysis. Baltimore, Md.: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

Widely used as a manual for language program administration and teachers and distributed to the various ASTP units as a suggested guide for senior instructors', i.e. linguists' "grammar" lectures.

Bloomfield, Leonard. Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages. Baltimore, Md.: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

Recommended and distributed as a guide in the application of audio-lingual methodology to ASTP objectives.

Boas, Franz. Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnology, Government Printing Office, 1911.

An early exposition of linguistic principles from which much of the methodology of the ACLS' Intensive Language Program was derived.

Cowan, J Milton and Graves, Mortimer. "A Statement on Intensive Language Instruction." German Quarterly, XVII, No. 4 (Nov., 1944), pp. 165-166.

Offered the first definition of the "intensive" language course.

German Quarterly, XVII, No. 4, Part 1 (Nov., 1944). An entire issue devoted to the ACLS Intensive Language Program.

Graves, Mortimer and Cowan, J M. Report of the First Year's Operation of the Intensive Language Program of the ACLS (1941-42). Dec. 20, 1942.

Hoenigswald, Henry M., McCarus, Ernest N., Noss, Richard B., and Yamagiwa, Joseph K. A Survey of Intensive Programs in the Uncommon Languages, Summer 1962. [Ann Arbor, Mich.?] , 1962.

The "Yamagiwa Report".

Martin, Samuel E. Language Study Techniques. New Haven, Conn.: Institute of Far Eastern Languages, 1951.

The best single source for the theories and implementation of the audio-lingual method of language instruction.

Matthew, Robert John. Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

In addition to ASTP, the author discusses the various Navy programs and the Civil Affairs Training Schools; describes several early implementations of the "army method" at the college and secondary level.

Najam, Edward W. (editor). Materials and Techniques for the Language Laboratory. Bloomington: International Journal of American Linguistics, January, 1962.

A collection of papers read at the Second Language Laboratory Conference held at Purdue University in March, 1961; includes a short paper by Lawrence Poston on "The Place of the Laboratory in the NDEA Institutes."

Parker, William Riley. The National Interest and Foreign Languages. Washington, D.C.: Department of State Publication 7324, 1961.

Presents a broad overview of foreign language instruction as it existed in the United States at the time; discusses, in general terms, past and present facilities and needs of the future; offers useful statistics as well as interesting background on the NDEA in terms of MLA efforts and influence.

Report of the President's Committee on the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages. [Norman Buck, et al] . Yale Reports, New Haven, Conn.: Mimeographed, May 15, 1944.

Background and authorization for the introduction of "intensive" (i.e. "double") courses in foreign languages at Yale.

Shively, Donald H., et al. Report on Chicago Seminar of the Committee on Summer Programs in Connection with NDEA Language and Area Center Programs, August 1-2, 1963. Stanford, Calif.: Dittographed, Sept. 16, 1963.

The "Shively Report."

Yamagiwa, Joseph K. See under Hoenigswald, Henry M.

Appendix III

Suggested Form for Documentation of Summer Proposals on Implementation of the Audio-lingual Method

Ten-week Intensive Summer Course in Elementary Chinese

Note: Capital letters indicate classes to be conducted by the linguist; lower-case letters indicate drill classes to be conducted by the drill master.

First Week — Second Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50		INTRO. TO SOUNDS OF CHINESE	memo-rization lesson 1	question answer drill 1	memo-rization lesson 2	question answer drill 2	memo-rization lesson 3	number drills lesson 3	memo-rization lesson 4	question answer drill 4
9:00 - 9:50	Registration and Orientation	pronun-ciation drill 2	pattern drill 1a	rhythm drills lesson 1	pattern drill 2a	rhythm drills lesson 2	pattern drill 3a	rhythm drills lesson 3	pattern drill 4a	numbers, rhythm lesson 4
10:10 - 11:00		pronun-ciation drill 2	pattern drill 1b	conver-sation lesson 1	pattern drill 2b	conver-sation lesson 2	pattern drill 3b	conver-sation lesson 3	pattern drill 4b	conver-sation lesson 4
11:10 - 12:00		vocab drill lesson 1	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 1	vocab drill lesson 2	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 2	vocab drill lesson 3	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 3	vocab drill lesson 4	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 4	vocab drill lesson 5
1:10 - 2:00		INTRO. TO READING	STROKE COUNTING	STROKES AND ELEMENTS	STROKES AND ELEMENTS	ELEMENTS AND RADICALS	ELEMENTS AND RADICALS	ELEMENTS AND RADICALS	ELEMENTS AND RADICALS	ELEMENTS AND RADICALS

Third Week — Fourth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	memo-rization lesson 5	question answer drill 5	review vocab drills	TEST, 1-5 ENGLISH-CHINESE	memo-rization lesson 6	question answer drill 6	memo-rization lesson 7	question answer drill 7	memo-rization lesson 8	question answer drill 8
9:00 - 9:50	pattern drill 5a	numbers rhythm lesson 5	review pattern drills	TEST, 1-5 CHINESE-ENGLISH	pattern drill 6a	numbers rhythm drill 6	pattern drill 7a	numbers rhythm drill 7	pattern drill 8a	numbers rhythm drill 8
10:10 - 11:00	pattern drill 5b	conver-sation lesson 5	review pattern drills	(free period)	pattern drill 6b	conver-sation lesson 6	pattern drill 7b	conver-sation lesson 7	pattern drill 8b	conver-sation lesson 8
11:10 - 12:00	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 5	review vocab drills	GRAMMAR REVIEW 1-5	vocab drill lesson 6	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 6	vocab drill lesson 7	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 7	vocab drill lesson 8	GRAMMAR LECTURE LESSON 8	vocab drill lesson 9
1:10 - 2:00	reading drills lesson 1	reading drills lesson 2	reading drills lesson 3	reading drills lesson 4	reading drills lesson 5	review reading 1-5	READING TEST 1-5	reading drills lesson 6	reading drills lesson 7	reading drills lesson 8

Fifth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	memo-rization 9	question answer drill 9	memo-rization 10	question answer drill 10	review vocab. 6-10
9:00 - 9:50	pattern drill 9a	numbers rhythm drill 9	pattern drill 10a	numbers rhythm drill 10	review patterns 6-10
10:10 - 11:00	pattern drill 9b	conver-sation 9	pattern drill 10b	conver-sation 10	review patterns 6-10
11:10 - 12:00	GRAMMAR LECTURE 9	vocab. drill 10	GRAMMAR LECTURE 10	review vocab. 6-10	GRAMMAR REVIEW 6-10
1:10 - 2:00	reading drills 9	reading drills 10	review reading 6-10	READING TEST 6-10	reading drills 11

Sixth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	TEST 6-10 ENGLISH-CHINESE	memo-rization 11	question answer drill 11	memo-rization 12	question answer drill 12
9:00 - 9:50	TEST 6-10 CHINESE-ENGLISH	pattern drill 11a	numbers rhythm drill 11	pattern drill 12a	numbers rhythm drill 12
10:10 - 11:00	(free period)	pattern drill 11b	conver-sation 11	pattern drill 12b	conver-sation 12
11:10 - 12:00	vocab. drill 11	GRAMMAR LECTURE 11	vocab. drill 12	GRAMMAR LECTURE 12	vocab. drill 13
1:10 - 2:00	reading drills 12	reading drills 13	reading drills 14	reading drills 15	review reading 11-15

Seventh Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	memo-rization 13	question answer drill 13	memo-rization 14	question answer drill 14	memo-rization 15
9:00 - 9:50	pattern drill 13a	numbers rhythm drill 13	pattern drill 14a	numbers rhythm drill 14	pattern drill 15a
10:10 - 11:00	pattern drill 13b	conver-sation 13	pattern drill 14b	conver-sation 14	pattern drill 15b
11:10 - 12:00	GRAMMAR LECTURE 13	vocab. drill 14	GRAMMAR LECTURE 14	vocab. drill 15	GRAMMAR LECTURE 15
1:10 - 2:00	READING TEST 11-15	reading drills 16	reading drills 17	reading drills 18	reading drills 19

Eighth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	question answer drill 15	review vocab. 11-15	TEST 11-15 ENGLISH-CHINESE	memo-rization 16	question answer drill 16
9:00 - 9:50	numbers rhythm drill 15	review pattern 11-15	TEST 11-15 CHINESE-ENGLISH	pattern drill 16a	numbers rhythm drill 16
10:10 - 11:00	conver-sation 15	review pattern 11-15	(free period)	pattern drill 16b	conver-sation 16
11:10 - 12:00	review vocab. 11-15	GRAMMAR REVIEW 11-15	vocab. drill 16	GRAMMAR LECTURE 16	vocab. drill 17
1:10 - 2:00	reading drills 20	review reading 16-20	READING TEST 16-20	writing drills 1	writing drills 2

Ninth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	memo-rization 17	question answer drill 17	memo-rization 18	question answer drill 18	memo-rization 19
9:00 - 9:50	pattern drill 17a	numbers rhythm drill 17	pattern drill 18a	numbers rhythm drill 18	pattern drill 19a
10:10 - 11:00	pattern drill 17b	conver-sation 17	pattern drill 18b	conver-sation 18	pattern drill 19b
11:10 - 12:00	GRAMMAR LECTURE 17	vocab. drill 18	GRAMMAR LECTURE 18	vocab. drill 19	GRAMMAR LECTURE 19
1:10 - 2:00	writing drills 3	writing drills 4	writing drills 5	writing drills 6	writing drills 7

Tenth Week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 - 8:50	question answer drill 19	memo-rization 20	question answer drill 20	review vocab. 16-20	ENGLISH-CHINESE EXAM 1-20
9:00 - 9:50	numbers rhythm drill 19	pattern drill 20a	numbers rhythm drill 20	review pattern 16-20	CHINESE-ENGLISH EXAM 1-20
10:10 - 11:00	conver-sation 19	pattern drill 20b	conver-sation 20	review patterns 16-20	READING, WRITING EXAM
11:10 - 12:00	vocab. drill 20	GRAMMAR LECTURE 20	review vocab. 16-20	GRAMMAR REVIEW 16-20	
1:10 - 2:00	writing drills 8	writing drills 9	writing drills 10	review writing drills	